

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN SURGICAL
HOSPITAL, LLC, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MAURICE LITTLE,

Defendant.

Case No. 18-13895

Honorable Nancy G. Edmunds

Magistrate Judge David R. Grand

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [81, 82]

Plaintiffs Southeast Michigan Surgical Hospital, LLC, Spine LLC, Summit Medical Group PLLC, Summit Physicians Group PLLC, Getter Done Transportation LLC,¹ and Kevin T. Crawford, D.O., P.C. (“Plaintiffs” or “Plaintiff Healthcare Providers”) initiated this lawsuit to recover payment from Defendant Maurice Little² for medical services they provided to him after he was injured in a motor vehicle accident. Before the Court are the parties’ third set of dispositive motions. (ECF Nos. 81, 82.) Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint (ECF No. 8) on April 12, 2019, and a Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 57) on April 20, 2020; Plaintiffs filed two Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF Nos. 10 and 45) on April 23, 2019 and November 22, 2019. This Court denied each of these motions. (ECF Nos. 23, 61, 64.) The present Motions for Summary Judgment from both parties are *identical* copies of the motions filed in this case over three

¹ Plaintiff Getter Done Transportation LLC is no longer a party as its claims have been dismissed. (See ECF Nos. 72, 73.)

² It would appear that the Clerk incorrectly entered Defendant’s name as Maurice “Littles” rather than Maurice “Little” in the case caption when opening this case. This error has since been corrected.

years ago, and are repetitive of the arguments asserted in the initial set of dispositive motions. *Compare* ECF No. 81 with ECF No. 45; and ECF No. 82 with ECF No. 57. As Albert Einstein would say—"the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results." As the parties have not asserted any new factual or legal arguments, the Court cannot give them a different result. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 81) is **DENIED** for the reasons stated in the Court's October 20, 2020 Opinion and Order (ECF No. 61); and Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 82) is **DENIED** for the reasons stated in the Court's December 28, 2020 Opinion and Order (ECF No. 64). Issues that are still outstanding—including those previously identified by the Court (*see, e.g.*, ECF No. 61, PageID.2778)—shall be decided at trial.

SO ORDERED.

s/ Nancy G. Edmunds
Nancy G. Edmunds
United States District Judge

Dated: May 23, 2023

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on May 23, 2023, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/ Lisa Bartlett
Case Manager